Importance of Exit Channel Fluctuations in Reaction Branching Ratios

G.F. Bertsch[1] and T. Kawano[2]

[1]*Department of Physics and Institute of Nuclear Theory, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98915, USA*

[2]*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*

arXiv:1701.00276v1 [nucl-th] 1 Jan 2017

Abstract

Statistical reaction theories such as Hauser-Feshbach assume that branching ratios follow Bohr's compound nucleus hypothesis by factorizing into independent probabilities for different channels. Corrections to the factorization hypothesis are known in both nuclear theory and quantum transport theory, particularly an enhanced memory of the entrance channel. We apply the Gaussian orthogonal ensemble to study a complementary suppression of exit channel branching ratios. The effect can be large enough to provide information on the number of exit channels. The effect is demonstrated for the branching ratios of neutron-induced reactions on a ^{235}U target.

`Draft: text/kawano/exit_fluctuations.2a.tex`

Introduction. Statistical approximations are extremely useful in nuclear physics, particularly in reaction theory. Examples are the Hauser-Feshbach and Weisskopf-Ewing formulas for reaction cross sections [1–3]. The underlying assumption of both is the factorizability of the cross section σ_{ab} from one channel to another as $\sigma_{ab} \sim \Gamma_a \Gamma_b$, where Γ_i is the average decay width through a channel. The factorization follows from Bohr's compound nucleus hypothesis [4], that the decay of a heavy nucleus has no memory of how it was formed. However, factorization is only justified when the reaction takes place through discrete resonances and there are many channels contributing to each decay mode. Otherwise, the fluctuations in the widths of the resonance gives rise to the well-known " width fluctuation correction" to the statistical models [5], most prominently as the "elastic enhancement factor." Similar effects in electron propagation through mesoscopic conductors are known as the "weak localization correction" and the "dephasing" effect [6, Sect. IV.C and IV.E].

While the nuclear correction is best known as an entrance channel effect, it can also be present in exit channels if the reaction branching ratios highly favor a decay mode with large fluctuations [7]. In this work we show that such situations can lead to effects large enough to provide bounds on the number of channels in the decay mode, even though the measurements are on averaged quantities and not on their fluctuations. This study was motivated in part by the quest for a theory of fission dynamics based on nucleon-nucleon interactions. That requires an understanding not only of the distribution of the fission channels but their coupling matrix elements to the other states.

The GOE statistical model. The factorization hypothesis and other statistical aspects of reaction theory can be tested theoretically by models that consider ensembles of Hamiltonians that mix the constituent configurations. The Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE) has been especially successful in this regard [8, 9]. The reaction theory is expressed in the matrix equations

$$K = \pi \tilde{\gamma}^T \frac{1}{E - H} \tilde{\gamma} \tag{1}$$

$$S = \frac{1 - iK}{1 + iK} \tag{2}$$

giving for the non-elastic cross sections [10]

$$\sigma_{nf} = \frac{\pi}{k_n^2} \sum_{c \in f} |S_{nc}|^2 \ . \tag{3}$$

In Eq. (1) K is a matrix of dimension $N_c \times N_c$, where N_c is the number of reaction channels

in the model. H is the $N_\mu \times N_\mu$ Hamiltonian matrix for the N_μ internal states in the model. The internal states are connected to the channels by the $N_c \times N_\mu$ reduced-width matrix $\tilde{\gamma}$. The complex phases of its elements are arbitrary; we choose them to be real. Eq. (2) relates the K-matrix to the familiar S-matrix of scattering theory. In Eq. (3) for the cross sections, n is the entrance channel, f is a set of exit channels that are grouped together in an experimental cross section, and c are the individual channels. The cross section depends explicitly on the entrance channel energy E_n via the neutron wave-number $k_n = \sqrt{2E_n M_n}$, with M_n the reduced mass.

In the GOE statistical model, the Hamiltonian H is sampled from the distribution [11]

$$H_{\mu,\mu'} = H_{\mu',\mu} = v_{\mu,\mu'} \left(1 + \delta_{\mu,\mu'}\right)^{1/2} \ , \tag{4}$$

where $\mu \geq \mu'$ and $v_{\mu,\mu'}$ is a Gaussian-distributed random variable. The ensemble is completely specified by N_μ and the r.m.s. Hamiltonian matrix element $\langle v^2 \rangle^{1/2}$. Here we shall characterize the GOE ensemble by D, the average level spacing in the middle of the distribution. The spacing is related to the matrix elements by $D = \pi \langle v^2 \rangle^{1/2} N_\mu^{-1/2}$. The $\tilde{\gamma}$ matrix associated with a GOE Hamiltonian can be assumed to have a diagonal structure of the form $\tilde{\gamma}|_{\mu,c} = \gamma_c \delta_{\mu,c}$. In this work, we also make the simplifying assumption that the γ_c are equal for all channels within a given decay mode f. When the matrix is transformed to the basis diagonalizing the GOE Hamiltonian, the amplitudes will be distributed over eigenstates according the Porter-Thomas distribution [12] with a number of degrees of freedom equal to the number of channels N_f. It will be convenient to specify the reduced width distribution by

$$\bar{\gamma}_f^2 = \frac{1}{N_\mu} \sum_{c \in f} \gamma_c^2 \ . \tag{5}$$

This is the average squared reduce width for the individual states in the ensemble. In the limit $\gamma_c^2 / N_\mu << D$, the average S-matrix decay widths Γ_f satisfy the relation

$$\Gamma_f \approx 2\pi \bar{\gamma}_f^2 \ . \tag{6}$$

Note also that $N_n = 1$ for the entrance channel; its reduced width controls the total reaction cross section [13].

The calculations reported below were carried out with codes that constructed the GOE distribution by Monte Carlo sampling of H and applying Eqs. (1-3). The codes and input data are provided in the Supplementary Material [14].

Application to branching ratios in the reaction $^{235}U(n,)$. Here we show by a physical example that branching ratios that heavily favor some particular exit channel can be severely suppressed. The behavior follows from the GOE statistical model as formulated in the last section and is thus universal. Our example is the neutron-induced reactions on ^{235}U. For neutron energies below $\sim$ 10 keV the predominant reactions are s-capture of the neutron followed by gamma emission or fission. An important quantity is α^{-1}, the ratio of the fission cross section σ_F to capture cross section σ_{cap}, $\alpha^{-1} = \sigma_F/\sigma_{cap}$. It varies in the range $\alpha^{-1} = 1 - 5$ at eV-to-keV energies. The capture widths and level densities can assumed to be constant over this energy interval, since the interval is very small compared to the excitation energy ($\sim$ 6.5 MeV) and capture takes place through many channels. Table I gives approximate values of measured D and Γ_{cap} which will be used to determine the parameters of the K-matrix. We will examine the cross section at $E_n = 10$ keV; the experimental values

TABLE I: Experimental observables for neutron-induced reactions on ^{235}U. The cross section data is at a neutron bombarding energy $E_n = 10$ keV. The last entry is the ratio of cross sections.

Observable	Value	Source
D	1 eV	[15]
Γ_{cap}	0.035 eV	[16]
σ_{cap}	1.05 b	[17]
σ_F	2.96 b	[17]
α^{-1}	2.8	

are also given in Table I. Note that the ratio of fission-to-capture is ~ 3 at this energy.

The K-matrix reduced-width parameters are determined as follows. The capture width is small compared to D and many channels contribute so we can safely apply Eq. (6); the equivalent Γ_{cap} is shown in Table II. The coupling to the entrance channel depends on E_n and is usually parameterized by the strength function S_0 as

$$2\pi\frac{\bar{\gamma}_n^2}{D} = S_0 E^{1/2}. \tag{7}$$

From total cross sections one finds $S_0 \approx 10^{-4}$ eV$^{-1/2}$ [16, 18],[19, Fig. 47] and we use that value to determine the entry in Table II. For the fission reduced width, we first make the

factorization approximation and assume that the nominal decay widths scale with the cross sections, i.e. $\bar{\gamma}_F^2/\bar{\gamma}_{cap}^2 = \sigma_F/\sigma_{cap}$.

TABLE II: Reduced-width parameters (eV) describing the neutron-induced reaction on ^{235}U at $E = 10$ keV, assuming a level spacing of $D = 1$ eV and factorization.

$2\pi\bar{\gamma}_i^2$		
$i = cap$	F	n
0.035	0.105	0.010

The number of channels and states in the K-matrix are still to be specified. As presented, the model is independent of the number of states as long as that number is large. We shall take $N_\mu = 100$. For the capture channels we take $N_{cap} = 5$, which is at the lower end of range allowed by the experimental data. The number of fission channels is not well known [20] and we consider two possibilities: model A with one fission channel and model B with five fission channels.

With all parameters now specified in the GOE K-matrix, we can compute the average cross sections and branching ratios. These are shown in Table III. In model A, one sees

TABLE III: Average reaction cross sections at $E_n = 10$ keV, comparing models A and B with experiment. Monte Carlo sampling errors are less than ± 0.05 b.

	N_F	σ_F	σ_{cap}	α^{-1}
Exp.		2.96 b	1.06 b	2.8
A	1	1.68	1.34	1.2
B	5	2.49	0.89	2.8

an enhancement of the capture cross section and a corresponding suppression of the fission cross section. Clearly factorization is violated. On the other hand, model B with its 5 fission channels agrees with experiment. Let us see if we can reproduce the experimental branching ratio simply by increasing the reduced width for fission, but keeping only a single channel. Taking the width as a free parameter, we obtain the branching ratios shown in Fig. 1. Clearly, there is no reasonable value that can reproduce experiment. Thus, we can exclude fission models having only a single channel, based solely on average cross section data.



FIG. 1: Cross section ratio $\alpha^{-1} = \langle\sigma_F\rangle/\langle\sigma_{cap}\rangle$ as a function of average fission width $2\pi\bar{\gamma}_F^2$ assuming a single fission channel. The point marked "HF" is the Hauser-Feshbach branching ratio corresponding to the input widths.

Discussion. The exit channel suppression comes about by two mechanisms that can be understood as follows. The part coming from Porter-Thomas fluctuations can be analyzed at the level of the K-matrix: assuming isolated resonances, the branching ratio can be calculated as in Ref. [16],

$$\alpha^{-1} = \left\langle \frac{\gamma_F^2}{\sum_f \gamma_f^2} \right\rangle \Bigg/ \left\langle \frac{\gamma_{cap}^2}{\sum_f \gamma_f^2} \right\rangle . \tag{8}$$

For case A, this gives $\alpha^{-1} = 1.3$ rather than the calculated factor of 1.2. So under these conditions the suppression is largely due to the width fluctuation correction. However, that is not the full story. At the largest fission reduced width we calculated, $2\pi\langle\gamma_f^2\rangle_K = 400$ meV, Eq. (8) gives $\alpha^{-1} = 2.9$, in agreement with experiment, while the full S-matrix branching ratio is only 1.8. We attribute the additional suppression to the constraint on statistical decay rates $W_f \equiv \Gamma_f$ imposed by the Bohr-Wheeler formula [21]

$$W_f = 2\pi DT, \tag{9}$$

where T is the transmission coefficient of the channel. General considerations of detailed balance require $T \leq 1$. The nominal fission width in the K-matrix reduced width is close to the bound, so it is not unexpected that there is a further suppression in the S-matrix.

Conclusion. We have demonstrated that branching ratios can be a useful observable in the study of fission dynamics near threshold. Namely, effects not included in the Hauser-

Theory can severely constrain the number of exit channels. In the example presented here, the energy of the fissioning nucleus is above the fission barrier. It might be of interest to apply the analysis to below-barrier fission as well [22]. There one sees sharp peaks in the fission cross section, ascribed to individual states along the fission path. These states act as fission channels with $N_F = 1$ in the K-matrix modeling.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Y. Alhassid for discussing connections to quantum transport theory and D. Brown for providing archived experimental data. We also thank W. Nazarewicz, R. Capote, and H.A. Weidenmüller for very helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

[1] J.E. Escher and F.S. Dietrich, Phys. Rev. C **74** 054601 (2006).

[2] V.F. Weisskopf and D.H. Ewing, Phys. Rev. **57** 472 (1940).

[3] W. Hauser and H. Feshbach, Phys. Rev. **87** 366 (1952).

[4] N. Bohr, Nature **137** 344 (1936).

[5] There is a large literature starting with P.A. Moldauer, Phys. Rev. C **11** 426 (1975).

[6] Y. Alhassid, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72** 895 (2000).

[7] P. Moldauer, Phys. Rev. C **14** 764 (1976)

[8] T. Kawano, P. Talou and H.A. Weidenmüller, Phys. Rev. C **92** 044617 (2015).

[9] G.E. Mitchell, A. Richter, and H.A. Weidenmüller, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82** 2845 (2010).

[10] There is also an angular-momentum statistical factor in Eq. (3) that we ignore here. See also footnote [13].

[11] M.L. Mehta, *Random Matrices*, 3rd Edition, Academic Press (2004).

[12] C.E. Porter and G.E. Thomas, Phys. Rev. **104** 483 (1956).

[13] There are in fact two independent entrance channels distinguished by total angular momentum and the actual resonance spacing is $D \approx 0.45$ [15]. The spacing within each channel is about twice D_0 [16]. We assume they behave similarly.

[14] The codes used for the calculations reported here are available upon request to `bertsch@uw.edu`.

[15] R. Capote *et al.,* Nuclear Data Sheets **110** 3107, (2009).

[16] M.S. Moore, J.D Moses, G.A. Keyworth, J.W. Dobbs and N.W.Hill, Phys. Rev. C **18** 1328

(1978), Table IV.

[17] M.B. Chadwick *et al.,* Nuclear Data Sheets **112** 2887, (2011).

[18] S. Mughabghab, *Neutron Cross Sections* Vol. 1B (Academic Press, 1984).

[19] A.J. Koning and J.P. Delaroche, Nucl. Phys. A **713** 231 (2003).

[20] M. Sin, R. Capote, M. W. Herman, and A. Trkov, Phys. Rev. C 93 034605 (2016)

[21] N. Bohr and J.A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **56** 426 (1939).

[22] O. Bouland, J.E. Lynn, and P. Talou, Phys. Rev. C **88** 054612 (2013).